



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,222	06/01/2006	Bart Gerard Bernard Barenbrug	NL03 1424 US1	1685

65913 7590 11/13/2008  
NXP, B.V.  
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
M/S41-SJ  
1109 MCKAY DRIVE  
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
----------

MEROUAN, ABDERRAHIM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/13/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/581,222	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BARENBRUG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/14/2008 has been entered.

### ***Specification***

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 14 discloses: "... computer readable medium ...", computer readable medium doesn't have any antecedent in the specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2628

3. Claims 1- 4 and 9 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietrich, JR et al. (U.S. PGPUB 20030179220A1), hereinafter Dietrich , In view of Wood (U.S. Patent 6567095 B2) hereinafter referred as Wood.

4. As per claim 1 Dietrich discloses: Computer graphics processor (Dietrich, Page 3, Paragraph [0044], lines 3-6) having a renderer for rendering in parallel N views of 3D images, (Dietrich, Page 6. Paragraph [0072], lines 2-5) said renderer comprising:

a rasterizer configured to transverse for transversing a surface grid over a surface of a primitive of a 3D image primitives (Dietrich, Page 3, Paragraph[0047], lines 3-5, Paragraph [0048], lines 1-2, and Page 4, line 1) for all N different views of said 3D image such that transversing is performed once for said 3D image (Dietrich, Page 4. Paragraph [0048], lines 1-3),

a shader unit configured to determine\_for determining a color of the output (Dietrich, Page 4. Paragraph [0008], lines 1-8), of the rasterizer and forward (Dietrich, Figure 1A-1, Block 152, and 153),\_a shaded color sample along with its screen coordinates (Dietrich, Page 4. Paragraph [0049], lines 1-3), and

N screen space resamplers (Dietrich, Page 4, Paragraph [0049], lines 9-10), each of said screen space resamplers being configured to resample the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit (Dietrich, Page 4. Paragraph [0050], lines 1-6).

Dietrich doesn't disclose:

Art Unit: 2628

N different views such that resampling is performed N times in parallel for said 3D image.

However, Wood discloses different views such that resampling is performed N times in parallel for said 3D image. (Wood, Column 3, lines 16-25, and Column 4, lines 23-32).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the Applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of Wood into the process taught by Dietrich, because through such incorporation would provide a stereoscopic image view.

5. As per claim 9, arguments used to reject claim 1 are the same arguments used to reject claim 1.

6. As per claim 2, Dietrich in view of Wood discloses: Computer graphics processor according to claim 1.

Dietrich doesn't disclose: a texture memory for storing texture maps, wherein said surface grid is derived from a texture map being associated with said primitive and being stored in said texture memory. However, Wood discloses: a texture memory (Wood, Column 6, line 13 ) for storing texture maps, (Wood, Column 6, lines 14 and 15) wherein said surface grid is derived from a texture map (Wood, Column 6, lines 15- 18 ) being associated with said primitive (Wood, Column 6, lines 24 -26 ) and being stored in said texture memory (Wood, Column 6, line 13 )

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the Applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of Wood into the process taught by Dietrich, because through such incorporation would provide an improved high speed access to the Texel.

Art Unit: 2628

7. As per claim 3, Dietrich in view of Wood discloses: Computer graphics processor according to claim 2

Dietrich in view of Wood doesn't disclose: wherein a grid associated to one of the texture maps stored in the texture memory is chosen as surface grid, if said texture map is addressed independently.

said texture map is based on a 2D texture, and the texture coordinates at the vertices do not make up a degenerate primitive.

However Wood discloses: wherein a grid associated to one of the texture maps (Wood; Column 6, lines 3- 4) stored in the texture memory is chosen as surface grid, (Wood; Column 6, lines 7 -10) if three requirements are fulfilled, said three requirements including:

said texture map is addressed independently. (Wood; Column 6, lines 33- 35)

said texture map is based on a 2D texture, (Wood; Column 6, lines 25- 26)

and the texture coordinates at the vertices do not make up a degenerate primitive. (Wood; Column 1, lines 38- 41)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the Applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of Wood into the process taught by Dietrich, because through such incorporation would provide an improved high speed access to the Texel.

8. As per claim 4, Dietrich in view of Wood discloses: Computer graphics processor according to claim 3.

Dietrich in view of Wood doesn't disclose:

Art Unit: 2628

the texture map with the largest area in texture space is chosen

if more than one texture maps stored in said texture memory fulfill said three requirements a)-c).

However, Wood discloses:

the texture map with the largest area in texture space is chosen (Wood; Column 6, lines 13 -15)

if more than one texture maps stored in said texture memory (Wood; Column 6, lines 22-24)

fulfill said three requirements a)-c). (Wood; Column 6, lines 33 to 35 and, lines 25 -26, Column 1, lines 38 -41)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the Applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of Wood into the process taught by Dietrich, because through such incorporation would provide a more flexible and efficient texture storage when generating a new image

9. As per claim 10, arguments used to reject claim 2 are the same arguments used to reject claim 10.

10. As per claim 11, arguments used to reject claim 3 are the same arguments used to reject claim 11.

11. As per claim 12, arguments used to reject claim 4 are the same arguments used to reject claim 12.

14. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietrich, JR et al. (U.S. PGPUB 20030179220A1), hereinafter Dietrich , in view of Wood (U.S. Patent 6567095

Art Unit: 2628

B2) hereinafter referred as Wood, and further in view of Hayhurst (U.S. PGPUB 20010012018

A1) hereinafter referred as Hayhurst.

15. As per claim 5, Dietrich in view of Wood discloses: Computer graphics processor according to claim 1 or 2

Dietrich in view of Wood doesn't disclose: A mean for addressing a display screen, said renderer having an input for a 3D model and an input for at least one viewpoint for rendering image information for supplying to the addressing means wherein the renderer further comprises an initial part having an input for the 3-D model and for at least one main view point for rendering objects in the form of at least one main view point Z-stack having stack layers with color information and Z-values the renderer further comprising a Z-stack constructor in which, from the at least one main view point Z-stack - generated by the initial stage, Z-stacks for additional viewpoints are constructed, and a further image information occlusion semantics stage for generating image information from the z-stacks . However, Hayhurst discloses:

A mean for addressing a display screen, (Hayhurst, Figure 1, Block 105)

said renderer having(Hayhurst Page 3 ,Paragraph [0026] , lines 15 to 16) an input for a 3D model (Hayhurst Figure 1, Block 106 and paragraph [0025] , line 12) and an input for at least one viewpoint for rendering image information for supplying to the addressing means(Hayhurst , Page 3, paragraph [0026] , lines 1- 2, and lines 15- 24)

wherein the renderer (Hayhurst , Page 3 ,Paragraph [0026] , lines 15 - 16) further comprises an initial part having an input for the 3-D model and for at least one main view point for rendering objects(Hayhurst Figure 1, Block 106 and paragraph [0025] , line 12) in the form of at least one



Art Unit: 2628

main view point Z-stack having stack layers with color information and Z-values (Hayhurst, Page 1, Paragraph [0009], lines 5 -7 and Page 2 ,Paragraph [0010] , lines 8- 14)

the renderer further comprising(Hayhurst , Page 3 ,Paragraph [0026] , lines 15 -16)

a Z-stack constructor in which, from the at least one main view point Z-stack (Hayhurst Page 2 ,Paragraph [0011] , lines 2- 12) generated by the initial stage, Z-stacks for additional viewpoints are constructed, and a further image information occlusion semantics stage for generating image information from the z-stacks (Hayhurst Page 2 ,Paragraph [0012] , lines 2 -11)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the Z-stack constructor as taught by Hayhurst into the process of the Dietrich in view of Wood to add Z-stack constructor for generating image information from Z-stacks.

18. Claim 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietrich, JR et al. (U.S. PGPUB 20030179220A1), hereinafter Dietrich in view of Wood (U.S. Patent 6567095 B2) hereinafter referred as Wood, in view of Hayhurst (U.S. PGPUB 20010012018 A1) hereinafter referred as Hayhurst, and further in view of Hanna et al. (U.S. Patent 006269175 B1) hereinafter referred as Hanna1.

19. As per claim 6. Dietrich in view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst discloses: Computer graphics processor according to claim 5.

Dietrich in view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst doesn't disclose: an object extractor for extraction of objects from a view point z- stack. However, Hanna discloses: an object extractor for extraction of objects from a view point z- stack. (Hanna1, Column 11, lines 25- 27)

Art Unit: 2628

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that adding an object extractor to the computer graphics processor as taught by Hanna1 into the process of the Dietrich In view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst and in view to provide an efficient view of 3D scenes on 3D display system.

20. As per claim 7. Dietrich In view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst: Computer graphics processor according to claim 6

Dietrich in view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst doesn't disclose: wherein the object extractor is arranged for extracting objects from the at least one main view point z-stack. However, Hanna1 discloses: wherein the object extractor is arranged for extracting objects from the at least one main view point z-stack. (Hanna1, Column 11, lines 25 - 27)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention the use of the object extractor as taught by Hanna1 into the process of the Dietrich In view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst and in v to describe the functionality of the object extractor from at least one main view point z-stack.

21. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietrich, JR et al. (U.S. PGPUB 20030179220A1), hereinafter Dietrich in view of Wood (U.S. Patent 6567095 B2) hereinafter referred as Wood, and in view of Hayhurst (U.S. PGPUB 20010012018 A1) hereinafter referred as Hayhurst, and further in view of Hanna et al. (U.S. PGPUB 20010036307 A1) hereinafter referred as Hanna2.

22. As per claim 8. Dietrich in view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst teaches: Computer graphics processor according to claim 5 .

Dietrich In view of Hayhurst doesn't disclose: wherein the DOF rendering stage is arranged for DOF processing of the at least one main view point z-stack into a at least one main view point z-stack comprising DOF blurring. However, Hanna discloses: wherein the DOF rendering stage is arranged for DOF processing.(Hanna2, Page 1, Paragraph [0013], lines 3- 5) of the at least one main view point z-stack into a at least one main view point z-stack .(Hanna2, Page 1, Paragraph [0038], lines 3- 5)comprising DOF blurring.(Hanna2, Page 1, Paragraph [0013], lines 5 -6)  
Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention the use of the DOF rendering stage as taught by Hanna2 into the process of the Dietrich in view of Wood and in view of Hayhurst for a high image resolution.

23. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietrich, JR et al. (U.S. PGPUB 20030179220A1), hereinafter Dietrich, in view of Wood (U.S. Patent 6567095 B2) hereinafter referred as Wood, and further in view of Hayhurst (U.S. PGPUB 20010012018 A1) hereinafter referred as Hayhurst.

24. As per claim 13: Dietrich, in view of Wood discloses: Method of rendering N views of 3D images according to claim 11:

Art Unit: 2628

Dietrich, in view of Wood doesn't disclose: further comprising the steps of: Supplying data and addressing means of a 3D display wherein for a main view point objects in the form of at least one main view point Z-stack comprising stack layers are rendered with RGB and Z-values constructing from the at least one main view point Z-stack, z-stacks for additional viewpoints and generating from the Z-stacks for additional viewpoints by means of Z-tracing data to be supplied to the addressing means. However, Hayhurst discloses: Supplying data and addressing means of a 3D display device (Hayhurst Figure 1; Page 3, paragraph [0026], line 1, lines 23-25) wherein for a main view point objects in the form of at least one main view point Z-stack comprising stack layers are rendered with RGB and Z-values (Hayhurst Page 2, Paragraph [0010], lines 8-14) constructing from the at least one main view point Z-stack, z-stacks for additional viewpoints, (Hayhurst Page 2, Paragraph [0011], lines 2-7) and generating from the Z-stacks for additional viewpoints by means of Z-tracing data to be supplied to the addressing means, (Hayhurst Page 2, Paragraph [0012], lines 2-11)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the Applicant's invention, to incorporate the teachings of Hayhurst into the process taught by Dietrich, in view of Wood, because through such incorporation would provide an improved high speed access for accessing data

25. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dietrich, JR et al. (U.S. PGPUB 20030179220A1), hereinafter Dietrich, in view of Wood (U.S. Patent 6567095 B2) hereinafter referred as Wood, and further in view of Burrell. (U.S. PGPUB 20030145008 A1) hereinafter referred as Burrell.

26. As per claim 14, Dietrich in view of Wood doesn't disclose: Computer graphics processor according to claim 9.

Dietrich in view of Wood doesn't disclose: Computer program product comprising program code means stored on a computer readable medium for performing a method according to claim 9, when said program is run on a computer. However, Burrell discloses: Computer program product comprising program code means stored on a computer readable medium for performing a method according to claim 9, when said program is run on a computer. (Burrell Page 4, Paragraph [0034], lines 7 - 9)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to run a program code stored in a computer as taught by Burrell into the process of the Dietrich in view of Wood, to perform the method of displaying 3D scenes on 3D display system.

### ***Response to Arguments***

27. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

28. The applicant arguments to amended claims, that the prior art doesn't disclose: " a rasterizer configured to transverse a surface grid over a surface of a primitive of a 3D image for all N different views of said 3D image such that transversing is performed once for said 3D image" as recited in the amended independent claim 1. This argument is not persuasive because Dietrich in view of Wood stated that:"... The transformed vertices form the input for a rasterizer

Art Unit: 2628

152. The rasterizer 152 computes a fragment for each pixel covered by each of the primitives. A coverage mask stored with the fragment indicates which portions of the pixel the fragment covers.” (see, Dietrich, Paragraph[0048]), also (see, Wood, Column 3, lines 16-25, and Column 4, lines 23-32).

29. The applicant arguments to amended claims, that the prior art doesn't disclose: " N screen space resamplers, each of said screen space resamplers being configured to resample the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit". This argument is not persuasive because Dietrich in view of Wood stated that:" ... An optional sample expansion stage 154 generates multiple samples for each fragment." (see, Dietrich, Paragraph[0049], lines 9-10), and (Dietrich, Page 4. Paragraph [0050], lines 1-6)

### ***Conclusion***

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xiao Wu can be reached on (571) 272-7761. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

Art Unit: 2628

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Abderrahim Merouan/

Examiner, Art Unit 2628

/XIAO M. WU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628